

NAYS—336

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clement
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson

Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchee
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)

Maloney (NY)
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton

Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Vitter
Walden

Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Ackerman
Becerra
Brown (FL)
Cannon
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Gekas
Gordon

Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Moakley
Morella
Owens
Pickering
Portman
Putnam
Rothman

Sanders
Scarborough
Scott
Shays
Sisisky
Toomey
Wexler

□ 1103

Messrs. GRUCCI, TERRY, BILIRAKIS, AKIN, CAMP, BONILLA, STUMP, JOHN, BRADY of Texas, TOM DAVIS of Virginia, PAUL, and ROSS changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MATSUI, CROWLEY, and INSLEE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 247, TORNADO SHELTERS ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time on this open rule.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) how many speakers he has remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have three speakers on this side.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest features of a deliberative body is adherence to the ordinary process unless there are extraordinary reasons. We have a process for the consideration of legislation. We have committees. We have subcommittees. We have hearings.

We have rules that a subcommittee should have a hearing and report a bill out or the committee should have the hearing; but in all events, committees should report a bill out. That is so that bills can be considered, deliberated, different people could be heard from whose perspectives one might never anticipate so that amendments could be offered to deal with difficulties that are perceived only during that process.

Now, I am not saying that that must be an ironclad process at all times. I am not saying that there cannot be exceptions because of exceptional circumstances.

But on this particular bill, the first I heard of it was last week when it was scheduled without my knowledge whatsoever for the Suspension Calendar. I communicated with Members of the leadership on the committee; and I said, Look, we cannot do this. We have not had any hearings whatsoever. We have not had any discussion. Let us pull the bill off, let us have some opportunity to discuss it, and we can take it up in a few weeks or so, unless there is some compelling reason, some compelling urgency.

That was my understanding of what the process was going to be. I was flabbergasted when I found out this week that it was still coming to the floor of the House without hearings, without committee deliberation, without the ability to offer amendments, but most of all, without any consultation with either me or the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the ranking member of the relevant subcommittee.

That means something. That means no respect either. That means no collegiality. That is not the way for the new Committee on Financial Services to start out this Congress. That is not the best way to bring up the first bill from the Committee on Financial Services, as if the minority Members, the Democrats, do not exist; and if they do exist, their rights are nonexistent.

It is not the bill so much, but it is this very offensive process. I do not want to unduly delay the deliberations of the body today. I am sensitive to the personal needs and times of the Members. But somehow we must be able to make this point. We do not want this to happen again. We want collegiality. We want bipartisanship. We have experienced it in the past. We expect it as Members of this body.

Now, with respect to the particular bill, it has a laudable goal; and I hope that I can wind up supporting it. I would like to. I have nothing but the highest regard for the sponsor of the bill. We have worked together on so many different causes over the years, particularly Third World debt. But, I really do not know the urgency. I suspect the Senate is not going to consider this until September. I could be wrong. But that means we do have some latitude of time.

Further, this deals with an amendment to the Community Development Block Grant program. Now, if we are going to deal with an amendment to the Community Development Block Grant program, I think that there are a number of things that we should consider.

First of all, if we are only going to make eligible shelters for tornadoes and

storms, there is some technical issues that should have been considered not on the floor of the House, but in subcommittee. For example, should we really give public monies to private for-profit entities to use? That is a serious issue. We ought to talk about that, deliberate about it.

Secondly, if we are going to use community development moneys, should we have income-targeting provisions? That is a serious issue that should have been dealt with in subcommittee rather than taking up the time of the floor.

Third, should there be a nonexclusivity clause with respect to the use of the shelters? By that, I mean should the shelter be open to the public, because a good many of these shelters would not be.

There are a host of other issues, too, that should have been brought up in connection with this bill.

So I just want the minority Members to understand, I do not want to make the biggest case in the world out of this, but all Democrats, despite the fact that we are in the minority, demand respect. Respect means that one must recognize and maintain our rights rather than trample on them. This should not happen again.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I assure our friends on the other side of the aisle that we mean no disrespect; that, quite on the contrary, we have great respect for their points of view as well as the fine work that they do on a daily basis.

We take note of the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE). All legislative bodies must balance, must balance a series of factors; and one factor, one such factor that is balanced in the equation is the need to proceed with important legislation. It is that factor that in our view outweighed other factors and today made us proceed, made the Committee on Rules come to the decision to proceed.

Now, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has worked long and hard, and I was pleased to see that the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) recognized and commended his leadership as well on this issue of public safety. That is why we believe that it is important to move forward.

In addition, we have, Mr. Speaker, another guarantee built in so that the minority will be respected in this process, cognizant as we are of the arguments made by the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE); and that is that the rule that we have brought forward is an open rule so that at least at this stage, the stage of the plenary consideration of the legislation, any Member can introduce and have considered any amendment to improve this important legislation.

So in that sense, we feel that, having taken notice of the comments made by

the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), we nonetheless are providing a mechanism and a vehicle for and of intrinsic fairness, which is the vehicle of an open rule and which I think that all of the Members should support as the goal for the functioning of this House whenever possible.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1115

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the proposed rule here today, and I hope that Congress is listening because if you listen very carefully, you will find out that you do not like this resolution, and you do not like this bill, and this is not the way the House should be operating and each of you should be aware of it.

Mr. Speaker, why are we ignoring the regular order? Why is it so important that it is brought to the floor without having the scrutiny of anyone. Tell me why. Is it urgent or is it an attempt to confuse or snooker? Is it an attempt to bring something to the floor that is needed by someone, and someone that will perhaps benefit from this piece of legislation? It looks like a relief act to me for somebody. Please look at this piece of legislation; and when you look at it, you will not like it because what it is doing is bringing to the floor a bill that would make a significant change in the Community Development Block Grant program.

Mr. Speaker, every time a bill like this comes to the floor, I come forward to speak against it because it is just another way of using the Community Development Block Grant funds to subvert general revenue funds and funds that should be used from that particular area.

All of us know that we can improve our bills more by sending them to committee. The gentleman spoke about an open rule. An open rule is fine, but it does not give the kind of substantive look and scrutiny that a committee can give, and we have a very strong committee to look at this.

President Bush talked about bipartisanship, and just a few weeks ago we went on a retreat where we talked about bipartisanship and respect. We talked about comity. You know what this particular process that they are using does, it undermines the bipartisan way we do things. It undermines the respect we have for each other. It undermines every tenet of bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, there are several issues raised by the bill which I disagree with, but the committee has not had a chance to look at it. If we adopt this proposed rule and consider this bill, you could fund tornado shelters at mo-

bile home sites which do not even have low-income or moderate-income residents.

You could take that money and help some of the low- and moderate-people in your community build homes or get jobs, but if you do this, which is within the law, you could do this, but if you did it, you would be taking the funds away from people who really need it.

Secondly, if you do this, some contractor or developer could build these shelters around their property using government funds; and when this is all over, that shelter belongs to that developer or property owner; and when someone in your district who might need a home, a moderate-income person, and you know how hard it is to get affordable housing in this country, you know how hard it is to get a house.

Mr. Speaker, nonetheless, I would have a hard time supporting this particular rule, and the bill as well, because I feel very deeply about the Community Development Block Grant program, and I have seen several runs on these funds. Each of you who have a pet project that you want, you come to the floor and make a run on the Community Development Block Grant funds. This was really a very bad way of doing it, and I think you should rethink this and go back to the bill and let them look at it. Go back to the committee and let them look at what you are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, Congress intended for these funds to be used for a distinct purpose. It did not mean for you to come to the floor with an emergency all of a sudden, look, here is a pile of money, let us use this for that emergency. Congress intended for you to take these moneys and help low- and moderate-income people. So this is inconsistent. It is very inconsistent with the core principle of Community Development Block Grant funds.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you, but I hope my colleagues who brought this to the floor will reconsider it because it does not lead to the kind of thing that we preach here in the Congress.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 23 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the author of this important legislation.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I think we have been asked a fair question here. Is this an attempt to snooker? Is this an attempt to deceive? No, it is an attempt to do neither. It is an attempt to save lives. It is an attempt to quit treating people who live in mobile home parks as second-class citizens under the HUD regulations.

The program director at HUD for shelter programs, for storm mitigation,

is the one that suggested this language to us. My county, which was hit by a tornado, 12 people, 10 of them in a mobile home, and during the main debate on the floor I will show you a picture of one of the young victims. She was alive being carried from her manufactured home. Her father and her 16-month-old baby were not as fortunate. They died.

Mr. Speaker, when the county approached the government and asked for Community Development Block Grant funds, they were told that mobile home sites do not qualify. Clearly that is what this legislation does.

Mr. Speaker, never consulted we are told. In fact, the committee had extensive talks with committee staff on the other side. I talked to one Democratic staffer myself. He asked, Do we need this. I told him what our answer had been. He called the program director. He got the same answer. He called me back and said, You are right.

Currently manufactured housing communities, mobile homes, are excluded from these grants. Low-income site-built homes qualify. Apartment buildings qualify. And not only that, but a \$500,000 site-built home, permanent home, qualifies for a grant from FEMA to build a safe room, but a mobile home does not qualify for a safe room because it does not have an interior hall, it does not have a room that does not have a window facing the outside. These shelters are, in certain cases, as the gentlewoman from Florida has said, going to be sited on mobile home parks; and the owners of those parks are going to be making money. It is a for-profit mobile home park. But I can tell my colleague that though it is going to turn a profit for the mobile home park operator, it is going to be a safe shelter in a storm for the people that live in those mobile homes, and this arcane argument is not going to sell with them.

Let me tell my colleagues something. This is an idea whose time has come. I have talked to at least 100 mobile home residents since this bill has received the endorsement of every major paper in Alabama, and they tell me about getting a warning that in 25 or 30 minutes a tornado is going to bear down on their home and they plot it there and they watch the TV as it bears down on them, as people say get in the basement, get inside, get in an interior hallway if you do not have a basement, and yet they have to sit there and listen to the warning and not heed that warning.

This is not my idea. This is the idea of a county that lost 12 people. It was their idea. They came to me. They went to the Federal Government. So did a community in Missouri. Both those communities were told they did not qualify.

Now, it will not be my decision and it will not be the decision of the gentlewoman from Florida as to whether this

money will be spent. It will be the local community. There are no mandates; there are no restrictions. The local community, a city, a county, can go to a mobile home park and they can build a shelter, which may be beside or between two or three. In fact, both the gentlewoman from Florida and I would agree when we say mobile home park operators, sometimes we are talking about a widow who has seven trailers on an acre lot and who wants to build a shelter for 15 people there.

Now, the fatality that I will show my colleagues, the so-called mobile home park this little girl was, was a half acre lot with four trailers on it owned by a relative. We believe that the little girl, and her brother and father, the two which are dead right now, we believe they ought to have the same right as someone living in a \$400,000 house to go to the government and get assistance for shelter. Anyone today can qualify for a safe room in their house. They can get \$2,000 to reinforce a room. But mobile home residents cannot.

Tornadoes do not make distinctions between site-built homes and manufactured homes. Neither should we. And this is of the essence. It is of the essence because I lost 41 citizens to a tornado 3 years ago and I lost 12 this past fall and it is past time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the gentleman from Alabama would suggest that we were trying to delay this. The majority has been in control of this Congress last year; this year. This could have been brought to our subcommittee and our committee at any time. No one is trying to delay this. The suggestion that the orderly process of subcommittee and committee is somehow a delay is nonsense.

Let us talk about why this bill is really up today. We ought to keep to an unavoidable minimum the times when people say things that are unlikely to be believed. We are not here because we expect a tornado tomorrow. If in fact this was important, we could have had the hearing last week, 2 weeks ago. This bill could have been on the floor today after a subcommittee and committee process.

We offered that to the gentleman from Alabama. Indeed, to his credit when I talked to him on Monday and said we just have a couple of questions about the bill, he said, let us pull it. But he was overruled by his leadership. Why? Because last night the Republican schedule called for the budget to be voted out, and today the Republican schedule calls for a vote on taxes. Now, we are not working very hard on anything that is not part of the President's agenda. Apparently, we are on the limited attention span approach. The people can only keep track of one or two

things at a time, so let us only do one or two things at a time.

The problem is that when we finished this hard-working Congress' business yesterday, at about noon, maybe it was 1 o'clock, I should not exaggerate. Members would have left. There was nothing to keep them for the week. And the Republican leadership was afraid they would not have the quorum they needed to put through the budget last night and to put through the tax bill today. So that is why this bill is on the floor today and everybody knows that, despite what they say.

Of course, it is important for us to provide help, but there is another issue I want to raise. If it so important to provide help, as I believe it is to these people living in the mobile home parks, why are we doing it without adding a penny to the pot from which it comes? That is part of the problem the gentlewoman from Florida and I have. We are expanding more and more the purposes of CDBG while providing CDBG with less and less. The whole Community Development Block Grant money now, thanks to the other party, has less money in its authorization and appropriation than it had years ago.

I would love to do this, but I would like to do it with an expansion of the money so that protecting these people who ought to be protected does not come at the expense of other important purposes.

And then there is one substantive question. This bill does not just say cover manufactured housing, which is a very important resource for low-income people in order to be better protected than they are, it says that the entity getting the Federal funds can give them to a for-profit entity, who presumably could then own the shelter.

□ 1130

The gentleman from Alabama conjured up the favorite device here, the ubiquitous poor widow. I sometimes think that poor widows must own about 97 percent of America, given the frequency with which they are the justification for various grants of money to private owners.

If in fact we are talking about providing special assistance to lower income owners, let us put that in the bill. That is why you have subcommittees. That is why you have committees. That is why you legislate. But, as I read this bill, nothing would prevent a community from helping to build a shelter for a wealthy owner of second-home manufactured housing which could then be part of that property and sold. Maybe I am wrong, and maybe that is not the case. I do not know that because we have not had a chance to discuss it in the kind of forum we ought to have. That is the issue here.

For scheduling purposes, the Republican leadership took a bill that should not have been controversial, that has

got a very laudable goal, as the gentleman from Alabama points out, and that could have been refined in subcommittee and committee.

I have to say one other thing that bothers me and the gentlewoman from Florida and the gentleman from New York. They would not do this to a banking bill. They would not do this to the securities industry. Community Development Block Grants is a disfavored program under this congressional regime. It is about poor people's needs, and poor people's needs are not often given that same consideration.

It is not an accident that the committee that used to be the Committee on Banking and Urban Affairs is now just the Committee on Financial Services. Not only did the title disappear but so did some of the concerns. We have real concerns about the ability of the CDBG program to meet all of its needs. When you continually add in new functions and do not give it any money but in fact reduce money, you cause stresses.

The goal of providing shelters for people in manufactured housing is wholly noncontroversial, and we would be glad to work on it. We would have been glad to work on it a month ago. This bill could have been brought up before that. We had a hearing in the subcommittee on the FHA. It was a very good hearing that the Chair called. I was glad that she did. But we could have used that time for this.

I should say, by the way, it does not occur to me that this decision was made anywhere but at the Republican leadership. I do not think we have an intracommittee problem here. We have a problem that the Republican leadership had a need to keep the Members here. They could not ground the planes and they could not force people to stay, so they put a bill on the floor. That is our method of house arrest. That is what we have got. It is a shame that this bill is being used for that purpose.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HORN).

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, this is obviously not an issue simply for Alabama and Florida. I want to say that, believe it or not, we had tornadoes in southern California 2 years ago where the roofs came off of parks in one of my cities, Paramount, where there is any number of parks there where people have moved out of their homes and lived in a much smaller level than they did when they were in those homes. But their houses are now gone.

This can happen in any particular State in this Union. Rather than argue over subcommittee, full committee and all that, it seems to me we are big enough to solve it in this Chamber. Those are simply tools of the House on some things. This is very clear, the use of Community Development Block Grant funds for construction of tor-

nado-safe shelters in manufactured home parks. That is what a lot of home parks are nowadays. I think a lot of us in this Chamber have fought for the rights of people in those parks.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida for his kindness at the beginning of the debate in taking some time. We were surprised how fast this came up for a debate. He gave us some time to get over here and be prepared. We thank him very much.

They have heard our concerns. They are credible. We hope that they listened to them. We do not like to have our rights trampled upon.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio for his kindness and, quite frankly, all of our friends on the other side of the aisle who have brought forth concerns which we note. But, as I stated before, in the balancing of interests before the Congress and in fact when we are dealing with the most instantly devastating natural disaster conceivable, we have brought forth in a very rapid fashion legislation to the floor of this House with an open rule that will save lives.

So for that fundamental reason, this legislation, which is a local option legislation, which does not force local communities to do anything but does provide the option for local communities to take steps to save lives, we believe that it is important to bring it forth. We believe that it is important to bring it forth rapidly, and in rapid fashion we are dealing with the most dangerous, instantly devastating natural disaster, which is the tornado.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) once again for his leadership on this issue.

I would urge all of my colleagues to support not only the underlying legislation but the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes the time for electronic voting on motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 1099 and H.R. 802 following the vote on House Resolution 93.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 246, nays 169, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—246

Aderholt	Green (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Akin	Green (WI)	Peterson (PA)
Armey	Greenwood	Petri
Bachus	Grucci	Pickering
Baker	Gutknecht	Pitts
Ballenger	Hall (OH)	Platts
Barcia	Hansen	Pombo
Barr	Hart	Pomeroy
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Pryce (OH)
Barton	Hayes	Putnam
Bass	Hayworth	Quinn
Bereuter	Hefley	Radanovich
Berry	Herger	Ramstad
Biggert	Hilleary	Regula
Bilirakis	Hobson	Rehberg
Boehler	Hoeffel	Reynolds
Boehner	Hoekstra	Riley
Bonilla	Horn	Rodriguez
Bono	Hostettler	Rogers (KY)
Boswell	Houghton	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant	Hutchinson	Ross
Burr	Hyde	Roukema
Burton	Isakson	Royce
Buyer	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Callahan	Istook	Ryun (KS)
Calvert	Jenkins	Sandlin
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Schaffer
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Cardin	Jones (NC)	Schrock
Castle	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Keller	Sessions
Chambliss	Kelly	Shadegg
Coble	Kennedy (MN)	Shaw
Collins	Kerns	Shays
Combest	King (NY)	Sherwood
Cooksey	Kingston	Shimkus
Cox	Kirk	Simmons
Cramer	Knollenberg	Simpson
Crane	Kolbe	Skeen
Crenshaw	LaHood	Skelton
Cubin	Lampson	Smith (MI)
Culberson	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Latham	Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann	LaTourette	Snyder
Davis, Tom	Leach	Souder
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Spence
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
DeMint	Linder	Strickland
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Stump
Dicks	Lucas (KY)	Sununu
Doolittle	Lucas (OK)	Sweeney
Dreier	Luther	Tancredo
Duncan	Maloney (CT)	Tauzin
Dunn	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Ehlers	Matheson	Terry
Ehrlich	McCarthy (NY)	Thomas
Emerson	McCollum	Thornberry
English	McCrery	Thune
Eshoo	McHugh	Tiahrt
Everett	McInnis	Tiberi
Ferguson	McKeon	Traficant
Flake	McKinney	Turner
Fletcher	Mica	Upton
Foley	Miller (FL)	Vitter
Fossella	Miller, Gary	Walden
Frelinghuysen	Moore	Walsh
Galleghy	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Ganske	Nethercutt	Watkins
Gekas	Ney	Watts (OK)
Gibbons	Northup	Weldon (FL)
Gilchrest	Norwood	Weldon (PA)
Gillmor	Nussle	Weller
Gilman	Ortiz	Whitfield
Goode	Osborne	Wicker
Goodlatte	Ose	Wilson
Goss	Otter	Wolf
Graham	Oxley	Wu
Granger	Paul	Young (AK)
Graves	Pence	Young (FL)

NAYS—169

Abercrombie	Baird	Bentsen
Allen	Baldacci	Berkley
Andrews	Baldwin	Berman
Baca	Barrett	Bishop

Blagojevich	Holden	Oberstar
Blumenauer	Holt	Obey
Bonior	Honda	Oliver
Borski	Hooley	Owens
Boucher	Hoyer	Pallone
Boyd	Inslee	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Israel	Pastor
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Capuano	(TX)	Phelps
Carson (IN)	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Carson (OK)	John	Rahall
Clay	Kanjorski	Rangel
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Clyburn	Kildee	Rivers
Condit	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Conyers	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Klecza	Rush
Coyne	Kucinich	Sabo
Crowley	LaFalce	Sanchez
Cummings	Langevin	Sanders
Davis (CA)	Lantos	Sawyer
Davis (FL)	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Larson (CT)	Scott
DeFazio	Lee	Serrano
DeGette	Levin	Sherman
DeLahunt	Lewis (GA)	Shows
DeLauro	Lipinski	Slaughter
Deutsch	Lofgren	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Lowey	Solis
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
Dooley	Markey	Stark
Doyle	Mascara	Stenholm
Edwards	Matsui	Stupak
Engel	McCarthy (MO)	Tanner
Etheridge	McDermott	Tauscher
Evans	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Farr	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Fattah	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
Filner	Meehan	Thurman
Ford	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Frank	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Frost	Menendez	Udall (CO)
Gephardt	Millender-	Udall (NM)
Gonzalez	McDonald	Velazquez
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Visclosky
Hall (TX)	Mink	Waters
Harman	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Hastings (FL)	Moran (VA)	Waxman
Hill	Murtha	Weiner
Hilliard	Nadler	Wexler
Hinchee	Napolitano	Woolsey
Hinojosa	Neal	Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Gordon	Portman
Becerra	Johnson, E.B.	Rothman
Blunt	Jones (OH)	Scarborough
Brown (FL)	Moakley	Sisisky
Cannon	Morella	Toomey
Clement	Myrick	

□ 1201

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BALDACCIO and Mr. HILLIARD changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for electronic voting on motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 1099 and H.R. 802.

COAST GUARD PERSONNEL AND MARITIME SAFETY ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of sus-

pending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1099.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LoBiondo) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1099, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—415

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Cubin	Hayes
Akin	Culberson	Hayworth
Allen	Cummings	Hefley
Andrews	Cunningham	Herger
Armey	Davis (CA)	Hill
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hilleary
Bachus	Davis (IL)	Hilliard
Baird	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinchee
Baker	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Baldacci	Deal	Hobson
Baldwin	DeFazio	Hoeffel
Ballenger	DeGette	Hoekstra
Barcia	DeLahunt	Holden
Barr	DeLauro	Holt
Barrett	DeLay	Honda
Bartlett	DeMint	Hooley
Barton	Deutsch	Hostettler
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Houghton
Bentsen	Dicks	Hoyer
Bereuter	Dingell	Hulshof
Berkley	Doggett	Hunter
Berman	Dooley	Hutchinson
Berry	Doolittle	Hyde
Biggert	Doyle	Inslee
Billirakis	Dreier	Isakson
Bishop	Duncan	Israel
Blagojevich	Dunn	Issa
Blumenauer	Edwards	Jackson (IL)
Blunt	Ehlers	Jackson-Lee
Boehlert	Ehrlich	(TX)
Boehner	Emerson	Jefferson
Bonilla	Engel	Jenkins
Bonior	English	John
Bono	Eshoo	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Evans	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Boucher	Farr	Jones (NC)
Boyd	Fattah	Kanjorski
Brady (PA)	Ferguson	Kaptur
Brady (TX)	Filner	Keller
Brown (OH)	Flake	Kelly
Brown (SC)	Fletcher	Kennedy (MN)
Bryant	Foley	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Ford	Kerns
Burton	Fossella	Kildee
Buyer	Frank	Kilpatrick
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Kind (WI)
Calvert	Frost	King (NY)
Camp	Gallely	Kingston
Cantor	Ganske	Kirk
Capito	Gekas	Klecza
Capps	Gephardt	Knollenberg
Capuano	Gibbons	Kolbe
Cardin	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Carson (IN)	Gillmor	LaFalce
Carson (OK)	Gilman	LaHood
Castle	Gonzalez	Lampson
Chabot	Goode	Langevin
Chambliss	Goodlatte	Lantos
Clay	Goss	Largent
Clayton	Graham	Larsen (WA)
Clement	Granger	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Graves	Latham
Coble	Green (TX)	LaTourette
Collins	Green (WI)	Leach
Combest	Greenwood	Lee
Condit	Grucci	Levin
Conyers	Gutierrez	Lewis (CA)
Cooksey	Gutknecht	Lewis (GA)
Costello	Hall (OH)	Lewis (KY)
Cox	Hall (TX)	Linder
Coyne	Hansen	Lipinski
Cramer	Harman	LoBiondo
Crane	Hart	Lofgren
Crenshaw	Hastings (FL)	Lowey

Lucas (KY)	Peterson (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Lucas (OK)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (TX)
Luther	Petri	Smith (WA)
Maloney (CT)	Phelps	Snyder
Maloney (NY)	Pickering	Solis
Manzullo	Pitts	Souder
Markey	Platts	Spence
Mascara	Pombo	Spratt
Matheson	Pomeroy	Stark
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stearns
McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)	Stenholm
McCarthy (NY)	Putnam	Strickland
McCollum	Quinn	Stump
McCrery	Radanovich	Stupak
McDermott	Rahall	Sununu
McGovern	Ramstad	Sweeney
McHugh	Rangel	Tancred
McInnis	Regula	Tanner
McIntyre	Rehberg	Tauscher
McKeon	Reyes	Tauzin
McKinney	Reynolds	Taylor (MS)
McNulty	Riley	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Rivers	Terry
Meek (FL)	Rodriguez	Thomas
Meeks (NY)	Roemer	Thompson (CA)
Menendez	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)
Mica	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
Millender-	Rohrabacher	Thune
McDonald	Ros-Lehtinen	Thurman
Miller (FL)	Ross	Tiahrt
Miller, Gary	Roukema	Tiberi
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Tierney
Mink	Royce	Towns
Mollohan	Rush	Trafficant
Moore	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Moran (KS)	Ryun (KS)	Udall (CO)
Moran (VA)	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Murtha	Sanchez	Upton
Myrick	Sanders	Velazquez
Nadler	Sandlin	Visclosky
Napolitano	Sawyer	Vitter
Neal	Saxton	Walden
Nethercutt	Schaffer	Walsh
Ney	Schakowsky	Wamp
Northup	Schiff	Waters
Norwood	Schrock	Watkins
Nussle	Scott	Watt (NC)
Oberstar	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Obey	Serrano	Waxman
Oliver	Sessions	Weiner
Ortiz	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Osborne	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Ose	Shays	Weller
Otter	Sherman	Wexler
Owens	Sherwood	Whitfield
Oxley	Shimkus	Wicker
Pallone	Shows	Wilson
Pascarell	Simmons	Wolf
Pastor	Simpson	Woolsey
Paul	Skeen	Wu
Payne	Skelton	Wynn
Pelosi	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Pence	Smith (MI)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Horn	Portman
Becerra	Istook	Rothman
Brown (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Scarborough
Cannon	Jones (OH)	Sisisky
Etheridge	Moakley	Toomey
Gordon	Morella	

□ 1212

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER MEDAL OF VALOR ACT OF 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 802, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by